

March 26, 1975

of fees for abstracting services, period. That would put the abstract in there but you have some language and you put everybody in jeopardy but the abstractor, himself, and I think the abstractor who is responsible, not the persons who serves and gives him good service.

SPEAKER: The chair recognizes Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. President, I put the kill motion on 310 the other day and Senator Dworak brought me his amendment and I think I understand...I think the amendment is substantially different than the bill in its form the other day and Senator Duis does raise some questions of definitions which probably could be put on if the bill were raised, if that were necessary, but I think the intent of Senator Dworak's amendments to LB 310 are satisfactory, at least as far as the objections that I raised the other day, in that he desires to prohibit discounts or rebates to any one other than the person which he means by client who is going to receive the direct benefit of the abstracting services and I don't think that he means to...I think he means to preclude that discount to any middle man person and I think that is a legitimate objective. The transaction between the recipient of the services, the ultimate beneficiary of the services and the abstractor should be a straight up transaction and he should be able to discount to him whenever he wants. He shouldn't be precluded from discounting to him but apparently there are middlemen situations where the discount goes to the middleman and not to the ultimate recipient of the services. I think that I am convinced personally that Senator Dworak's goal is desirable and that with the amendments LB 310 would be a good bill and we should revive it.

SPEAKER: The chair recognizes Senator Duis.

SENATOR DUIS: I am only going to speak once more on this, and I am going to tell you exactly the position you are going to put this client or the person who is getting the services in. In the first place, you don't include title insurance in here. All you are doing is including abstractors and title insurance should receive the same benefit as the abstractors because it provides the same service that the abstract does. The second place is this, why would anybody, then, in the middle of this situation any longer provide a service to that abstractor by becoming a middleman if he is able to get the client a rebate and another client not a rebate. I still think that it is the abstractor's business and not the middleman's business and the abstractor should be restricted. If that is your desire, the abstractor should be restricted from giving a rebate on the basis that he would then lose his license. I don't believe you should put a middleman in jeopardy here. Let me say again. We do not do any of this and I am sure that most real estate brokers, loan companies and so on and so forth but what you are trying to do here is to correct an abstractor's problem by putting somebody else in the middle.

SPEAKER: The chair recognizes Senator Kelly.